

1 REMARKS

2 Status of the Claims

3 Claims 1-27 are pending in the application and Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11 - 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 24
4 having been amended to more clearly define the present invention.

5 Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

6 The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 18-21 and 24-27 as being anticipated by Kuramoto
7 (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,120, hereinafter referred to as "Kuramoto"). The Examiner asserts that Kuramoto
8 describes each element of applicants' claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons
9 noted below.

10 In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this response,
11 the following discussion focuses on amended independent Claims 1, 11, and 19. The patentability of each
12 dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed in detail. However, applicants' decision not to discuss
13 the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that
14 applicants concur with the Examiner's conclusion that these dependent claims are not patentable over the cited
15 references. Similarly, applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim
16 element, or every comment made by the Examiner, should not be considered as an admission that applicants
17 concur with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding those claims. Indeed, applicants believe
18 that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited. However, a specific traverse
19 of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the
20 same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

21 Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 1

22 With regard to amended independent Claim 1, significant differences exist between Kuramoto and
23 applicants' claim recitation, because Kuramoto's invention is not taught or suggested to be an accessory to an
24 *existing antenna system*, and because Kuramoto does not teach or suggest physically coupling and mounting a
25 support for a conductive surface to a wireless device.

26 The Examiner asserts that Kuramoto anticipates applicant's claim, because: "*Kuramoto shows in*
27 *Fig. 2, an accessory 10 and method for increasing range and for use with an existing antenna system 20 with*
28 *a support 10 coupled to a wireless device and having conductive material 12, curved and straight (Figures 7*
29 *and 11) disposed on the support 10 all arranged for the purpose recited. The device is deemed to be clipped*
30 *or bracketed to the existing antenna.*" (Page 2, paragraph 2 of Office Action.)

1 However, as amended, applicants' subparagraph (a) in Claim 1 now recites: "*a support adapted to be*
2 *removably coupled and physically mounted to a wireless device at a predefined distance from at least one of*
3 *an existing internal antenna system and an existing external antenna system thereof, where the external*
4 *antenna system includes an external antenna that is physically mounted on and physically supported by the*
5 *wireless device.*" (Emphasis added.) One aspect of applicants' claim is thus that the accessory is intended to
6 be used with an *existing* antenna system. In contrast, Kuramoto's reflector is apparently a component of the
7 antenna system that Kuramoto discloses, as opposed to being an accessory for use with an *existing* antenna
8 system.

9 Figure 1 of Kuramoto is a perspective view showing a preferred embodiment of a LAN antenna 1, and
10 Figure 2 of Kuramoto is an exploded view that shows the embodiment of Figure 1, with reflector 10 spaced
11 apart from an elemental portion 21, which extends vertically from a base table 22. From the related
12 description of Figure 1 and based on the showing of the drawing itself, it appears that the existing antenna
13 system of Kuramoto, which is shown as an assembled unit, includes both a LAN antenna and reflector. In
14 contrast, applicants' claim recites an **accessory** that includes a support adapted to be removably coupled and
15 physically mounted to a wireless device at a predefined distance from at least one of an existing internal or
16 existing external antenna system, as illustrated by FIGURES 2A, 2B, 3A, and 3B, and as described by the
17 related portions of applicants' specification. Thus, Kuramoto is not particularly relevant, because it does not
18 teach or suggest an accessory to an *existing* antenna system, whether internal or external.

19 Also, Kuramoto fails to teach or suggest a support for a conductive surface that is "*removably coupled*
20 *and physically mounted to a wireless device.*" Instead, each embodiment of the antenna system taught by
21 Kuramoto is shown to be separate and distinct from the wireless device to which the antenna can be
22 electrically connected. For example, in Figure 3a, Kuramoto clearly indicates that the antenna is coupled to a
23 coaxial cable, and the specification of Kuramoto indicates that RF power is supplied to sleeve antenna 30 via a
24 coaxial cable consisting of a coaxial center conductor 32 (Kuramoto, column 3, lines 44-46). The Examiner
25 has indicated that in Figure 2 of Kuramoto, support 10 has conductive material 12. However, support 10 is not
26 coupled to or mounted on any wireless device. Instead, support 10 is positioned on base table 22, with
27 elemental portion 21 extending through a hole 11 in the reflector. Kuramoto does not show or indicate that
28 support 10 is removably coupled or mounted to any wireless device. Accordingly, the rejection of
29 independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kuramoto should be withdrawn, for the reasons given
30 above, since Kuramoto does not teach or suggest all of the recitation of independent Claim 1.

1 Claims 2-6, 8, and 10 ultimately depend from independent Claim 1. Because dependent claims
2 inherently include all of the steps or elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claims
3 ultimately depend, dependent Claims 2-6, 8, and 10 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed
4 above with regard to independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 2-6, 8, and 10
5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kuramoto should be withdrawn.

6 Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 11

7 Independent Claim 11 is directed towards a method of increasing at least one of a range and a
8 directionality of a wireless device. As amended, Claim 11 recites “removably physically mounting the support
9 for the conductive surface to the wireless device, at a predefined distance from at least one of any existing
10 external antenna system mounted on and physically supported by the wireless device, and any existing internal
11 antenna system of the wireless device.” Kuramoto teaches a separate external antenna system, but does not
12 show any external antenna system that is mounted on and physically supported by any wireless device. For
13 this reason, as well as the same reasons noted above in connection with the traversal of the rejection of
14 independent Claim 1, it is apparent that Kuramoto does not teach or suggest the recitation of Claim 11.
15 Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 11 over Kuramoto, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), should be
16 withdrawn, since Kuramoto clearly does not teach or suggest all of the recitation of independent Claim 11.

17 Claims 12-15 and 18 ultimately depend from independent Claim 11. Because dependent claims
18 inherently include all of the steps or elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claims
19 ultimately depend, dependent Claims 12-15 and 18 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed
20 above with regard to independent Claim 11. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 12-15 and 18
21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kuramoto should be withdrawn.

22 Discussion of the Rejection of Independent Claim 19

23 Independent Claim 19 is directed towards an accessory for use with at least one of an existing external
24 antenna system and an existing internal antenna system of a wireless device. Once again, for the reasons given
25 above, in connection with traversing the rejection of independent Claim 1, and further, because Kuramoto does
26 not teach or suggest “*enabling the at least one of the extended range and the desired directional characteristic*
27 *of a wireless signal transmitted or received by at least one of an existing internal antenna system and an*
28 *existing external antenna system to be wirelessly enhanced by the accessory*,” the rejection of independent
29 Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kuramoto should be withdrawn, for the reasons given above, since
30 Kuramoto does not teach or suggest all of the recitation of independent Claim 19.

1 Claims 20-21 and 24-27 ultimately depend from independent Claim 19. Because dependent claims
2 inherently include all of the steps or elements of the independent claim from which the dependent claims
3 ultimately depend, dependent Claims 20-21 and 24-27 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed
4 above with regard to independent Claim 19. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 20-21 and 24-27
5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kuramoto should be withdrawn.

6 Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

7 The Examiner has rejected Claims 7, 9, 16, 17, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being
8 unpatentable over Kuramoto and further in view of Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,300 hereinafter referred to
9 as "Johnson"). Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons discussed below.

10 Claims 7 and 9; 16-17; and 22-23 ultimately depend from independent Claims 1, 11, and 19. Because
11 dependent claims inherently include all of the steps or elements of the independent claim from which the
12 dependent claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 7 and 9, 16-17, and 22-23 are patentable for at least the
13 same reasons discussed above with regard to independent Claims 1, 11, and 19. Accordingly, the rejection of
14 dependent Claims 7 and 9, 16-17, and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kuramoto and further in view of
15 Johnson should be withdrawn.

16 In view of the Remarks set forth above, it will be apparent that the claims remaining in this application
17 define a novel and non-obvious invention, and that the application is in condition for allowance and should be
18 passed to issue without further delay. Should any further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to
19 telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

20
21 Respectfully submitted,

22 
23

24 Ronald M. Anderson
25 Registration No. 28,829

26 SKM/RMA:elm

27
28 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed
29 envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on October 24, 2005.

30 Date: October 24, 2005

